

AMESBURY PLANNING BOARD
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 62 FRIEND STREET
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2014 – 7:00 P.M.

Present: Howard Dalton, Lars Johannessen, Scott Mandeville, Karen Solstad, Ted Semesnyei.

Absent: David Frick and Robert Laplante.

Also Present: Nipun Jain, City Planner; Paul Bibaud, Recording Secretary.

Municipal Council referral Bill # 2014-098 Zoning Amendment / PUD Zoning

Nipun Jain: We had proposed certain revisions to the proposed zoning amendment, 2014-098.

What you have tonight are some minor edits to that revision. I was trying to differentiate between the ones that were in the document presented to you at the last meeting. The minor edits are in **bold** on your documents. To recap, at the last meeting,

There were two major comments that I heard. One was the provision for the minimum lot area calculations in the PUD waterfront sub-district that was brought out and some minor changes to include the Powow River along with the Merrimac River and the waterfronts district for Chapter 91 provisions. So going page by page, there are no changes on pages 1, 2, 3. The change is on page 4, under APPLICABILITY AND PERMITTED USES, I added under 3 A, I've added single family, given that we have proposed that single family residential structures be considered in the PUD Gateway sub-district, which is the Baileys Pond area. Then moving down, there were some comments on the language. On page 5 at the top, you'll see in brackets, "the PLB may reduce the setback and height requirements on the TDD." The question was, when you say reduce, will it reduce the height or are you suggesting that the PLB will waive the height and setback requirements in that district? So in order to clarify, I made the paragraph say "that upon written application, duly submitted to the PLB, the board in appropriate cases, subject to applicable conditions set forth below and elsewhere in this byline, subject to appropriate conditions, safeguards and limitations, the board may grant a special permit to allow A. the minimum lot area calculations to be modified as stated below, or B. requested relief from height, front, rear or side setback requirements for existing historic buildings in the PUD W sub-district. Number 4, 5, and 6 were all in one paragraph, so I took that and broke it down into bullets, and I also added 1, 2 and 3, which was one of the comments asking "what are historic buildings?"

Historic buildings will be defined pursuant to the provision of section 11 J2, which is the Historic Preservation – Special Permit, which defines what a historic structure is. So that is what #1 says. It says a building is historical if it meets the criteria of section 11 J 2.3, which is the applicability section of that section of the bylaw. Bullet #2 says: the special permit application shall include information required under sections of the preservation permit, which are saying documentation with regards to existing historic building, the survey maps, the photographic evidence, things that are usually produced by the property owner to validate that it is historic, what is the historicity of the property, meaning how have you come to the conclusion and demonstrated by evidence that it is actually historic, so you provide that information as a way to establish the history of the site from its historical uses and how they changed over time. It establishes a framework for the redevelopment of that site. That's the purpose for #2, which goes to the point of, if a historic property is seeking to be altered, expanded or added to, then the board needs to understand what the parameters are in which it is being changed. Number 3 is really the proposed building design and how is it compatible. Those are the building design

standards for which the board has talked about on such projects, as to what are the historic elements of either existing buildings or structures on the property. So any alterations or additions should be compatible with those particular standards. This is all based on discussions we've had in the past. One of the things that came up was the minimum lot area calculations. Currently, it says that it shall be the seasonal mean high water line. This is not something that we're introducing as new. This exists already in the bylaw. It is not for calculating the density; it is only to satisfy the minimum lot area requirement in the PUD district, which is 5 acre minimum. So other than the fact that it will allow the site to be in compliance with the minimum lot area requirements, it does not grant any other benefit to the property owner, because the density is not going to be based on the lot area. The density in this sub-district will be based on the total build out, meaning the buildable area, which in this sub-district is 40 % of the total lot area and the open space that is required to be left, which is not being changed. So nothing has been changed, per se. One clause that you can add, if it helps you, is that the existing developed land area shall not be expanded. That would then give you the ability to regulate what area is being disturbed or not being disturbed, in addition to what is already is there.

Karen Solstad: OK, that is better. I think it needs to be very explicit to read that the minimum lot area for the whole thing can be calculated using ...

Nipun Jain: It is not about the lot area. That is a new clause, that the minimum lot area calculations as listed here. So this can be amended. So do you think that the language should be "yes, it may be modified to include any portion of the lot below the seasonal mean high water line, as long as the existing disturbed or developed land portion of the area is not expanded?" That site is totally built out. There is no ...

Karen Solstad: I'm just very leery of knowing that ... I don't know if you found out anything when you were researching?

Lars Johannessen: I found out that Massachusetts laws are bizarre. They go back to 1640, and the public access rights to properties is bizarre. It says you can fish, hunt, and swim off of the space between the mean high water and the mean low water.

Nipun Jain: Wouldn't that be covered in the Chapter 91 license, which requires that any such area that is being historically used by the public will continue to be accessible to the public?

Karen Solstad: This is such an old piece of law. Something just goes against my grain to say that below the mean high water mark, out 500 feet, someone could come up with a deed that says "we own halfway out into the Merrimack River, so we want that land area."

Lars Johannessen: I would say that the Merrimack Hat Factory filled up to and including the mean low water mark, thereby they are done. They are flat land is what you see, and they can't do anything more, and nothing more can be counted.

Karen Solstad: It's a very complex part of Massachusetts law, and I don't feel that I can say that we can comply with ...

Lars Johannessen: If there had been a wharf there, historically, then that wharf would've counted for something. But there has not been a wharf there. I looked at Provincetown, which has a map of their mean high water mark as calculated by the state. Here and there, it juts into the water, because historically there had always been a wharf there. Other places, the houses and big industrial complexes are below the mean high water mark.

Nipun Jain: Scott David, property manager for Hat Factory, the sea wall is done. I believe there is no work to be done on the riverside, because the sea wall and the public access area has already been fully established for Phase 1 and more or less established for Phase II area.

Scott David: Correct. There is no expansion expected or proposed to expand towards the water, and the Chapter 91 license is already in effect and will have to be amended. It has the public access walkway along the riverbank, which has to be completed with Phase II. It goes up to Merrimac Street.

Karen Solstad: I guess I'm confused about why we have this specific language of four that says the minimum lot area calculation shall include not going out to the middle of the river if we can come up with a poorly written deed from 1790 that says the land goes out to the middle... I just don't know why that first part of the sentence is there.

Scott David: I can also tell you that the site plans that have been submitted previously have the water line marks already on them. That wasn't an issue.

Karen Solstad: Because we didn't have any of this language proposed as saying that we'll let the applicant count another ten acres of land that is out to sea.

Scott Mandeville: For setting precedent going forward, as well. We have a low water mark somewhere near the lake or something, where there is an extra ten acres and suddenly we end up with 60 or 80 or 100 more units, because of that sort of thing.

Nipun Jain: I think if the goal is to allow waiver from the minimum lot area calculation, which is 5 acres... I'm just trying to establish what are the objectives, and then see if we can modify this language. So the objective is, we want to establish a minimum lot area, which we know is 5 acres, in this district. We want to be able to determine what is the existing lot area for lots that are on the water, because we have the street on one side but we don't have a finite established edge on the water side, and for the purposes of area calculations, we are trying to define that edge. If the overall goal is to modify or allow modification in the lot area calculations, so that it is not required to strictly adhere to the 5 acre minimum, then possibly this language can be amended to say "or an established sea wall as approved by the Army Corps of Engineers" because that is a finite defined edge on the water side. Then, if the area comes out to be less than 5 acres, then the board, through the special permit, may allow that the area be reduced, 4.93 or whatever. Does that make sense, Scott?

Scott Mandeville: Why the requirement to allow it under 5 acres if we don't go below the high water line?

Nipun Jain: I'm just trying to say that the premise of the zoning is that you have to have minimum area requirements, height, setbacks, etc. We know that.

Lars Johannessen: So the question is then, as the hat factory stands now, is the calculation to make it 5 acres include the minimum mean high water?

Scott David: It is not 5 acres down there. It is 4.9 or so.

Karen Solstad: I would rather go with something about... something that we can waive if there is this defined point by the army corps of engineers, this defined space, rather than putting in language that is very hard to establish. I know how loosey goosey these things can be. Growing up in a seacoast town, issues of water access have been litigated all over this state over the years in many different ways. I don't want to open up a can of worms.

Nipun Jain: So number 4, tell me how this sounds: "the minimum lot area calculations shall be allowed to include any portion of the lot or a lot that is approved by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Chapter 91 license, and as included and as referenced in federal, state, and local data. Maybe we take that out too. So, the minimum area calculations shall be allowed to include any portion of the lot that is approved by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Chapter 91 licensing.

Scott Mandeville: What if it was to include any portion of a lot at or above the seasonal high water line, or with some sort of review regulation or approval from the PLB or Army Corps of Engineers.

Nipun Jain: OK, so “at or above the seasonal mean high.”

Scott Mandeville: Right. Just so we’re not counting a whole bunch of land that is usually under water, but allowing provision for the PLB to approve a project when we come close to that required lot size. Just so our hands aren’t tied when we have something that is 4.9 or whatever.

Lars Johannessen: It gives us a way to approve it, but also keeps you out of the water.

Nipun Jain: Ok. So “the minimum area calculation shall be allowed to include any portion of a lot at or above the seasonal mean high water line, and be consistent with the permit issued by Army Corps of Engineers through its Chapter 91 licensing.

Scott Mandeville: Because that allows for sea walls where you’ve created an artificial edge where you couldn’t really define it otherwise. That sounds good.

Nipun Jain: OK. More on page 5: In bold, I added language to the Gateway Sub-district, which is the non-developed vacant land on Baileys Pond: “Based on the sketch plans, drawings, and any other material the applicant submits relevant to the tract under consideration, the PLB shall make a determination as to the number of number of conventional lots that can be achieved on the proposed site.” The point of this is, as is being proposed here, a property owner in that sub-district will use a 15,000 square foot lot as a base for determining what the conventional density yield will be on that parcel or tract of land. But further, after complying with that requirement and open space requirements and buffers, we still want the board to be able to see that they are not doing a plan that requires a 2:1 slope or is proposing lots that cannot be built. So we’ve taken this language from your cluster residential special permit, where the board establishes what is the yield plan. So once the yield plan is established by the board, then they can prepare a cluster plan, and again, the added language will say that a cluster plan shall also be prepared as per standards outlined in section 11 D. 3A, which references standards for preparing for the cluster plan, identify primary resource areas, the secondary resource areas, and which basically is environmental resources, scenic vistas, so that they are taken into consideration when the cluster layout is done. If you recall, 7 to 10 years ago, the study that the PLBs consultant did was really about that. They looked at the site, identified areas on the site where slopes were more than 3:1, vegetated areas, areas close to the ramp, areas that are close to water, and the view sheds were identified. Then the areas left over were used to create pockets of multi family developments. So this allows the board through these regulations to require that the cluster plan follow that sort of programmatic design. So we’ve added that, just to be clear of how you prepare a cluster residential plan. We’re not trying to re-invent the wheel. We’ve taken what had been a successful methodology for preparing a new plan, and a successful methodology for creating a cluster plan and incorporate that here for that sub-district only. Page 6: we added B: when only single family residential structures are proposed, the minimum lot size for the proposed single family residential lots shall be 10,000 square feet in the CRP. This is in reference to the cluster residential plan allowed in the PUD Gateway sub-district. So if the developer or property owner chooses to propose single family lots, then they would be required to be a minimal of 10,000 square feet, which again is what we allow in all of the residential districts, if you are doing a cluster residential special permit. Again, we’re not creating any new standard. It is a standard that the board and the city already use. We just referenced that here. The difficulty was, instead of just referring the standards directly to the cluster residential special permit section, we had to refine and take some of the languages that can dovetail this section into the design standards of

that section, but some of it had to be pulled and clarified in establishing density and dimensional requirements. That is why it is stated here.

B. PARKING: Again, this has been something the board has been asking several times. Bicycle racks shall be provided for a minimum of ten bicycles in a safe and convenient location, easily accessible from the open space parks and trails. This goes on to bring in the recommendations of the open space plan, the master plan, that there should be alternative modes of transportation and to encourage a non-motorized vehicle in the city, especially if you are going to require bike trails, pedestrian ways, and public access areas, then the whole premise is to bring bicycles to these areas. Then if you have bicycles, you need a place to store them. No other changes on page 6.

Scott Mandeville: Re: bicycle racks. There should be something subtle included there, such as permanently installed or some mention as to how they are in place, so we don't get aluminum light things that get set down and beat up, etc. Like maintaining them, etc.

Nipun Jain: Those would go into legal documents that pertain to the maintenance of the site. So: "bicycle racks shall be permanently installed as approved by the board." That captures the purpose, which is we don't know where they will be. Next to a board walk, public park, next to a sidewalk? So this allows you to require whatever sort of maintenance or installation requirements are needed.

Page 7: Top of the page, I added the words POWOW after Merrimack, so on the third line: "area of the Merrimack or Powow River." Then on the fifth line: "Merrimack or Powow River. At the bottom of this page: it's a long paragraph there, so I added the language under MASTER SITE PLAN REVIEW "the following information shall be included in or provided with such plan." None of those have changed, I just created bullets 1 through 6. At the end of sub bullet 6 on page 8, it says "and a list of all waivers requested." The reason why it is in brackets is because it is being deleted or eliminated.

Then, under DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS. I added F, saying recreational trails and bike paths, the minimum width for recreational trails and bike paths shall be 8 feet. Unless stated otherwise, the paths shall be finished with stone dust. That is a base requirement. The board can require, depending on how those bike paths or pedestrian ways are provided, they can be asphalt or something else, but the goal is to establish a minimum 8 foot width, which is more traversable and manageable, so even if you have a case like Baileys Pond, vegetation growing and not being cleared on a regular basis, you'll still have maybe a four foot path cleared. Otherwise, no changes were made.

To recap the changes for you: no changes on pages 1, 2, 3, 4. Changes on page 5 to subsection 4, the minimum lot area calculations shall include any portion of the lot at or above the mean high water line that is approved by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Chapter 91 licensing. Also provided that the area is dedicated to a marina, boat yard, or other water dependant use, provided a permanent public access easement is deeded along the waterfront for a continuous bike and pedestrian pathway and connected to the closest public land. So that is a traditional criteria for you to waive the requirements, if so necessary for the minimum lot area calculations. Page 6: When only single family residential structures, then under parking: bicycle rack shall be provided and installed as approved by the board for a minimum of 10 bicycles in a safe and convenient location.

Lars Johannessen: Motion that we recommend with revisions and changes proposed to ordinance 2014-098 as amended to the municipal council, seconded by Howard Dalton. Vote was unanimous.

Motion was made by Lars Johannessen to close the public hearing for Municipal council referral bill # 2014-098. Motion was seconded by Howard Dalton. All in favor.

LOT RELEASE (99-101 Friend Street) Lot 1

Nipun Jain: We are all familiar with this. These are the two house lots that were approved by the board on Friend Street. This is a three lot subdivision that includes the existing two family residential structure, as well. For some reason, that was included in the covenant as well. At the last meeting, the board released lot 2 and 3. Lot 3 has the existing two family. Because the applicant did provide all of the information and got a sign-off from DPW. The only thing remaining for lot 1, which is the house lot on the corner of Powow Villa and Friend Street, is the architectural drawings. I think they are not where they should be. Given that the board's next meeting is October 27, and he still, after he gets the lot release and puts in a foundation, and only then can he do the sidewalk, it puts us in a very awkward situation, where we say put in the sidewalk, close the road, do everything. So my suggestion would be that the house plans be reviewed by the planning board subcommittee, which can meet earlier. So if the subcommittee signs off on the house plans, whether this week or next week, sooner the better for him, then there is a way to achieve both objectives, because he has met every other condition that was required, as far as legal documents, he posted a \$10K bond, which was not required but I asked him, as assurance that he will continue to do what is needed, so we have that. Are the house plans really bad? Not really, but it could be much better. There are changes. It is a deviation from the one that was approved by the board. It showed an attached garage. This one doesn't have an attached garage, which changes the whole architectural scale and size of the house, because it is a different footprint now. I think it is more appropriate that the PLB subcommittee had a chance to really look at it, because they are the ones who reviewed the conceptual design, understood what was being proposed, the scale and size. So if the subcommittee reviewed it and had the developer make the changes, it would achieve the same objective as coming to the PLB meeting on Oct. 27, when the subcommittee will have its recommendations. Even if the subcommittee exchanges comments via e-mail, then meet at a flexible time, it would be best that way for all.

Scott Mandeville: What were the reasons for the change? Did they have any, or did they just submit something different?

Nipun Jain: The garage would have consumed two thirds of that side of the house. We had envisioned a second story over the garage, so it would be an extension of the second floor on top of it. He doesn't see it like that, now that he is getting into it. He sees that that side of the house is basically be a blank wall, and then the floor space inside would function differently. I disagree.

Ted Semesnyei: As long as the developer is open to working with the subcommittee, and not just come in and stonewall suggestions. That's a waste of time for subcommittee.

Nipun Jain: the way the decision was written is, if you follow and produce house designs, A: that as approved sub division plans shown to a design pursuant to standards that the subcommittee had agreed to, then the planner can sign off. Well, there have been changes on both counts. I don't feel comfortable signing off. What I don't see as a valid purpose is to come before the full board if there is a subcommittee that is willing to review that aspect, and tell the developer "you've got to do that, and if you do it, you are ok. If not, come back at the Oct. 27 meeting and explain your position to the PLB."

Lars Johannessen: Is lot 1 the one that he has already started on?

Nipun Jain: No, it is the house on Friend Street. Lot 2 is the one he has started on.

So my request to the PLB is: to approve the release of lot 1 subject to the house plans being modified by the developer per recommendations of the PLB subcommittee.

Motion was made by Howard Dalton of “so moved” re: Nipun Jain’s request of the board.

Motion was seconded by Karen Solstad. Vote was unanimous.

Nipun Jain: So I will have the form signed today, which will not have the signature of one of the subcommittee members, until they have reviewed and signed off on the house design. So the sooner he does it, the sooner he gets the signature on the lot release.

Amesbury Animal Hospital, Erosion Bond, at 277 Elm Street

Nipun Jain: The project has been issued a CO. All the work was done, meaning the site improvement work was done. What they are requesting is a release of the erosion control bond, which is separate from the performance bond.

Lars Johannessen: I took a drive out there this morning, just to see what was there. There was no grass, there was dying vegetation, and there...

Nipun Jain: That is part of the performance bond.

Lars Johannessen: Well, beyond the erosion wall that they put up, was a bunch of brush and debris that I’m not sure if it was put there after work on the site and just dumped over the wall they had there.

Karen Solstad: Is the erosion control bond supposed to cover explicitly...

Nipun Jain: When a vacant site is disturbed, and there is no building, no driveway, so it is to prevent the runoff of dug up site when you are doing drainage, your putting in a foundation, a driveway, parking.

Lars Johannessen: All this requires that you have this siltation fence up.

Nipun Jain: Yes, and the siltation fence is removed only when the Amesbury ConCom signs off on the CoC. So they still haven’t received that, and that is where, at the time of the issuance of the CoC, the ConCom agent will verify that A. the site is not eroding, all the debris is gone, so all the issues that you are pointing out, Lars, are usually checked at the time of the issuance of the CoC. For erosion control bond that the PLB establishes, it is more to ensure that the site is not in a situation where it starts to affect the abutting property or the public ways from runoff, soil draining or coming onto property other than the owner’s property.

Lars Johannessen: Since there is no grass there at this point, any of that soil is unstable and will wash away.

Nipun Jain: So the thing is that, even if you release all the erosion control bond money, they will not get it released per se, until the ConCom signs off on it. The premise of today’s request is you find that the site is stabilized, that there is no evidence of any runoff happening from the site. But as far as grass not growing, if there is the siltation fence that may or may not be there, and that is impacting the resource areas, that could be covered under the CoC. And the PLB can easily say “look, we don’t have a problem under our regulations, to release the erosion control bond, because we have the performance bond as a back up, but we will advise the ConCom to verify before they issue a CoC that the grass is growing, that the vegetation is stabilized, and that there is no debris on the site that should not be there.

Karen Solstad: I guess I’m confused because I don’t understand how they meet our part of the erosion control bond, if it hasn’t rained in a month, September being the driest in the last 100 years, and there is nothing but open dirt on the property that slopes down to the street and slopes down to the neighbor, and there is no siltation fence along the sidewalk on Elm Street, if it rains...

Nipun Jain: I understand what you are saying, but the language is, if the site is stabilized, meaning it has been graded as per the approved grading plan, that the site has been hydro-seeded or there is evidence of plantation, it may not have survived, but right now, there is no evidence, at the time of request, that there is any erosion.

Karen Solstad: But if I put a hose on it for five minutes, it'll erode.

Ted Semesnyei: This isn't clicking for me right now. The letter states: "this letter is serving as a formal request that 100% of the erosion control bond money release. Based upon the final erosion control inspection by Cammett Engineering, substantial grass growth and soil stabilization as required by the PLB Certificate of Approval and Order of Conditions.

Karen Solstad: He's confusing it with ConCom, re: OoC, so that's an error. And there is no grass growth.

Howard Dalton: We still have \$50K worth of performance bond. I don't see a big deal here.

Nipun Jain: The performance bond is for the final landscaping. Erosion control bond is to ensure that the site is not a mess. Example: 37 Middle Road, where we put stop work on it, if the siltation was not working, etc. It is a construction site, and it is to prevent a site being left as a construction site, unattended which may result in issues to abutters and to the public.

Karen Solstad: So for this property, because it hasn't rained, we can't put in a stipulation that "it is not stable, mud is flowing off of the property..."

Nipun Jain: And if that happens, you can use the performance bond at that point.

Karen Solstad: So we have no problems with saying "stop everything, you're not getting your performance bond back, the mud is flowing onto neighbor's property, flowing into the street..."

Nipun Jain: Yes, if a situation arises now where the grades change, if there is a mudslide, then yes, and it is coming either A. onto private property, or B. or public ways, then the procedure would be that we notify them to say: "A. do emergency repairs and do whatever you need to do to stabilize the site, and then B. to provide evidence in a timely manner of how you are going to prevent it, and have the grass grow. If you don't, then we will have to use the performance bond." There is no easy way to say that you cannot be allowed to use the site at this point.

Ted Semesnyei: So is there anybody within town hall that is officially given the ok that it is fine to release the erosion control bond?

Nipun Jain: Everybody has signed off, like the check for me is, we have a checklist where all of the departments sign off: police, fire, DPW, engineering, ConCom, they all sign off. From their perspective, they signed off. ConCom has signed off on the occupancy, they have not signed off on the CoC. Unless you have evidence that it is not operating properly, that is all we can do but to release the erosion control bond.

Howard Dalton: The erosion control bond is there in case he walks away and leaves the site a mess. We can use it to restore the site and mitigate runoff on other's properties. The performance bond has a landscaping component to it, and if the landscaping deteriorates, then we grab the performance bond or we don't give them back whatever it takes for them to move forward.

Motion was made by Howard Dalton to release the erosion control bond. Motion was seconded by Ted Semesnyei.

Lars Johannessen: So he can't get an occupancy permit until we release the erosion control bond?

Nipun Jain: No. I have already signed off on the project for occupancy. That says that he has done everything he was supposed to do at the time of the request, meaning all site improvements have been completed.

Karen Solstad: I guess I see a big gaping hole that he hasn't done the site improvements. I would amend the release of the erosion control bond to include that a letter be sent to the project manager stating that we are releasing the erosion control bond but stating that there has been no grass growth, and the soil may or may not be stabilized, and that this has nothing to do with the OoC for the ConCom.

Nipun Jain: What may also be prudent is that you send a copy of that letter to ConCom, saying that all the applicant is requesting is the release of the erosion control bond. We are doing so. Please do note that our site authorization is "X,Y, Z." Then there will be more leverage if the ConCom pursues it vs. the PLB.

Karen Solstad: I don't want them to think that, "oh, we've got our erosion control bond because I sent them a letter that says X, Y, Z and they gave me the money. So obviously..."

Scott Mandeville: We're also quickly running out of time to get grass on the site. Winter is when bare ground is most susceptible to erosion, which would happen from freeze – thaw, snow melting and runoff, etc.

Nipun Jain: I have often asked ConCom that, instead of the PLB holding the erosion control bond, it should be ConCom. They are the ones who can go after and have more clout. After the site is properly graded, and a CO is issued, the regulations are such that we really cannot hold the erosion control bond. We can hold the performance bond. So I would do that with no problem.

Motion by Howard Dalton to amend his original motion to include that we request a letter be written and sent to ConCom about our concerns about grass growth, and sent to the applicant as well. Motion was seconded by Scott Mandeville. Vote was unanimous.

Motion by Lars Johannessen to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Howard Dalton.

Meeting adjourned at 8:08 P.M.